



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/573,707

03/27/2006

Mitsunobu Yoshida

1003510-000165

3545

21839 7590 04/17/2008
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

HARRIS, GARY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/573,707	Applicant(s) YOSHIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner GARY D. HARRIS	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 8 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/27/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendments to specification are acknowledged.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I claims 1-5 & 9-12 in the reply filed on 2/29/2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that applicant argues that Group I is directed to a laminate, and Group II claims 6-8 are drawn to a method of producing a laminate. This is not found persuasive because Group I is directed to a two layer laminate, whereas Group II is directed to a multiple layer laminate not limited to two layers. Applicant argues that no undue search burden exists, however Group I (laminates) are found in class/subclass 428/846.6, 428/847, 428/847.1, while Group II is found in class 427.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 & 9-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettigrew et al. US 4,960,651, and further in view of Jin et al. US 7,106,163.

As to Claim 1, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses magnetic layers in partial contact (via discrete islands)(Col. 9, Line 47-64) utilizing Fe-Si-B alloys (col. 5, Line 54-59) similar to applicant. Pettigrew et al '651 discloses the magnetic output being dependent on the thickness of the magnetic material but, does not disclose the resistivity of the layered structure. However, Jin et al. '163 discloses a polypropylene thermoplastic (high molecular compound) in contact with a magnetic material and manipulation of permeability by addition of soft magnetic materials (utilizing JIS 0505 resistivity) overlapping applicants resistivity (see figures 3 & 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to require a resistivity from 0.1 to 10^8 ohm-cm in the Pettigrew '651 invention in order to control the relative permeability of the core member as taught by Jin et al. 163 (Col. 7, Line 30-56).

As to Claim 2-4, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses the high molecular compound (polymer film) over a two layer magnetic component being made of an amorphous metal and a stainless steel (Col. 14, Line 22-54) and sectional area magnetic output being dependent on the thickness of the magnetic material (Col. 11, 12, Line 65-68, 1-9 respectively) but, does not disclose resistivity. However, as previously disclosed in claim 1, Jin et al. '163 discloses a polypropylene thermoplastic (high molecular compound) in contact with a magnetic material and manipulation of permeability by addition of soft magnetic materials (utilizing JIS 0505 resistivity) overlapping applicants claim (see figures 3 & 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to require a resistivity from 0.1 to 10^8 ohm-cm in the Pettigrew '651 invention in order to control

Art Unit: 1794

the relative permeability of the core member as taught by Jin et al. 163 (Col. 7, Line 30-56).

As to Claim 5, Pettigrew et al. '651 discloses the use of amorphous metal and silicon steel similar to applicant (Col. 5, Line 23-45).

With respect to claims 9-12, the intended use of the instantly claimed apparatus is noted, however, the intended use does not patentably distinguish said claimed apparatus over prior art. The intended use of the claims does not structurally limit the apparatus. In addition, the prior art apparatus is capable of performing the desired function.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GARY D. HARRIS whose telephone number is (571)272-6508. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith D. Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Holly Rickman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794
For Gary Harris